REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated April 20, 2005, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Claims 1, 4-6, 8 and 11 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over USP 5,093,908, hereinafter *Beacom*. *Beacom* includes, among other elements, a logic circuit 302 which receives several inputs such as the output from the sequencer 301, the output of the exception mask register 360, and bus lines 304. If the inputs to the logic 302 meet certain conditions, the logic 302 outputs a hold signal 303. See column 6, lines 9 – 18. The hold signal is not a signal received by the logic 302, it is merely an on/off type signal to stop the control store 130 to inhibit the next word. See column 4, lines 65 – 68.

The Examiner alleges that the logic circuit 302 corresponds to the claimed "selector". However, the selector is clearly defined in claim 1 as selectively supplying the dedicated circuit portion with selected control signals that are selected from among the first *control* signals supplied from the sequence control portion and the second *control* signals supplied from the general purpose data processing unit. Claim 1 further indicates that the second control signals supersede the first control signals and the general purpose data processing unit is able to control the dedicated circuit portion instead of the sequence control portion. Thus, as now defined in claim 1, the "selector" selects from among first and second control signals.

In contrast to the claimed selector, the logic 302 of *Beacom* does not select from among a plurality of control signals. The logic 302 merely outputs a single hold signal 303 if certain conditions are met. Thus, whereas the selector of claim 1 actually transfers control of the dedicated circuit portion from the sequence control

portion to the general purpose data processing unit, the logic 302 of *Beacom* is merely an on/off switch. This is completely different than the claimed selector that selectively supplies the dedicated circuit portion with <u>selected control signals</u> that are selected from among the first *control* signals supplied from the sequence control portion and the second *control* signals supplied from the general purpose data processing unit.

The Examiner further alleges that the hold signal 303 is subsequently supplied to the control store 130, which is part of the dedicated circuit portion. However, the element 130 is the control storage, but the control of the hold act is only used in the control of the main processor, as shown in Figure 4A.

Accordingly, Beacom does not teach or suggest claim 1 as amended in the last response. Similar amendments were also made to independent claims 8 and 11. The remaining claims are dependent claims that depend from one of claims 1, 8, or 11. Accordingly, all of the claims should now be in condition for allowance.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application is general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: 7-28-05

By: William C Rowland

William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

VA 764075.1